Appeal: 08-8221 Doc: 18 Filed: 02/26/2009 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-8221

FRANK SKINNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; BUREAU OF PRISONS; HARLEY LAPIN, Director; DIRECTOR RAMIREZ, Clinical Director; K. WHITE, Mid-Atlantic Region Director; G. MALDONADO, Warden, United States Penitentiary Atlanta; A.W. YARK; P.A.M. ITTAYEM; R. CRAIG, Counselor; AL HAYNES, Warden, United States Penitentiary Hazelton; V. PURI, Health Care Administrator; D. BOYLES, R.N.; R. MCFADDEN, Western Region Director; T.A. BANKS, Warden, Federal Correctional Institution Victorville; ADMINISTRATOR DEVEZA, Health Service Administrator; B. BARTON, M.D.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Elkins. James E. Seibert, Magistrate Judge. (2:07-cv-00077-REM-JES)

Submitted: February 19, 2009 Decided: February 26, 2009

Before WILKINSON, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Frank Skinner, Appellant Pro Se. Rudolph Contreras, John F. Henault, Jr., Assistant United States Attorneys, Washington, D.C.; William E. Coonan, Assistant United States Attorney, Fairview Heights, Illinois, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 08-8221 Doc: 18 Filed: 02/26/2009 Pg: 2 of 2

PER CURIAM:

Frank Skinner seeks to appeal the district court's order denying leave to amend his complaint filed pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), and the order denying reconsideration. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The orders Skinner seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED